

REMARKS

Claims 1, 28, 53, and 61 are amended. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification and drawings, examples of which may be found in relation to FIG. 3 and page 12. Claims 12-14, 27, and 65-85 are cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-11, 15-26, and 28-64 are pending. The Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the following remarks.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 28 were amended, thereby obviating this portion of the rejection. With regards to claims 53-59, 63, 64, and 65 the Examiner rejected these claims for not “positively reciting” the features. The Applicant respectfully disagrees as there features are positively recited. Indeed, the use of “to” and “for” may be found throughout thousands of patents issued by the USPTO, some of which were issued by the current Examiner. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-11, 15-18, 20, 22-26, 28-32, 35-36, 51-52, and 80-84 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,200,864 to Hollingsworth (hereinafter “Hollingsworth”). Claims 19, 33, 34, 37-50, 53-60, 61-69, and 71-73 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Hollingsworth in view of U.S. Publication No. 2007/0093292 to

Stone et al (hereinafter “Stone”). Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Hollingsworth in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0093012 to Bush et al (hereinafter “Bush”). Claim 70 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Hollingsworth and Stone in view of Bush.

Claim 1 has been amended, and as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold/italics below) recites a method, comprising:

- *outputting, in a user interface configured to verify an identity of a single user for access to an identity integration system, one or more of a plurality of questions having answers that do not involve a user name or password of the single user;*
- *if correct answers to the one or more questions are received via the user interface,* outputting a user interface configured to interact with the identity integration system to perform collective password management for multiple user accounts, each of the multiple user accounts being associated with the single user;
- receiving a selection of selecting multiple data sources connected to an the identity integration system input by the single user via the user interface, wherein each of the multiple data sources corresponds to a different one of said multiple user accounts;
- receiving a new password input by the single user via the user interface; and
- performing an administrative password operation on multiple passwords each associated with each one of the selected multiple data sources to collectively update each said of the multiple passwords to the new password, wherein the password operation is performed using the identity integration system.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the submitted references, alone or in combination, teach this feature. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-11, 15-26, and 28-52 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Each of the dependent claims is allowable based on the same rationale discussed with respect to claim 1. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 53 has been amended, and as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold/italics below) recites an apparatus comprising:

- a processor; and
- a web application for password management executable on the processor having one or more modules including:
 - a user identifier to find user identity information in an identity integration system that corresponds to a single user;
 - identity information query logic to search information in the identity integration system for accounts associated with the single user;
 - an account lister to display the accounts associated with the single user;
 - an account selector to designate at least some of the displayed accounts for password management;
 - a password inputter to determine a new password input by the single user to associate with each designated accounts; and
 - a password manager to collectively manage passwords for the designated accounts that correspond to the single user by requesting an update of a password associated with each designated account to the new password, responsive to the user input, ***the update performed if correct answers to one or more questions are received via a user interface that are output in an event of a lost password to access the web application.***

It is respectfully submitted that none of the submitted references, alone or in combination, teach the “lost password” feature recited above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 54-61 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 53 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Each of the dependent claims is allowable based on the same rationale discussed with respect to claim 53. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 53, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 61 has been amended, and as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold/italics below) recites an apparatus comprising a processor coupled to memory, the memory storing one or more modules executable via the processor to implement:

- an interface for coupling an identity integration system with a password management web application;
- logic for communicating with the identity integration system, wherein:
 - the identity integration system is capable of collectively updating a password on multiple data sources that use various functions of password updating responsive to input of a single new password by a single user, *the identity integration system including a lost password feature that is selectable to provide one or more of a plurality of questions having answers that were previously supplied by the single user;*
 - *each said data source includes a user account that corresponds to the single user;*
 - the identity integration system includes a management agent for each of the multiple data sources to manage data communication between the identity integration system and each respective data source; and
 - for at least some of the multiple data sources a management agent for the data source is configured *to obtain* credentials *from the single user* to perform password management *so that the credentials are not stored beforehand by the identity integration system;*
- logic for communicating with the password management web application;
- logic for searching for objects in the identity integration system; and
- logic for checking a connection status between the identity integration system and a data source.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the submitted references, alone or in combination, teach the “lost password” feature recited above. Additionally, the asserted references rely on storage of the passwords, which as mentioned at page 12 of the currently application may make the passwords vulnerable to hackers. Thus, the asserted references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest “the credentials are not stored beforehand by the identity integration system” as recited in claim 61 as amended. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 62-64 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 61 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Each of the dependent claims is allowable based on the same rationale discussed with respect to claim 61. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 61, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Application is in a condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated October 16, 2009

By: /William J. Breen, III/
William J. Breen, III
Reg. No. 45,313
509.755.7253